

**Stuart Foundation Convening April 17- April 19, 2002:
Permanence for Older Children and Adolescents**

Brief Summary:

This convening was hosted by the Stuart Foundation, San Francisco, as part of its Youth Permanency Project. As a long range outcome, the Youth Permanence Project focuses on strengthening practice and policy in order to ensure permanency for older children and youth in (a) California and Washington, and (b) nationally.

History: The issue of permanency for older children and youth has lacked serious attention in all but a few places and misconceptions about the issue abound, including the following: a) no one wants to adopt teens; b) teens do not want to be adopted; c) placements of teens are unsuccessful. Often, professionals working with teens focus on Independent Living, important certainly, but the need for permanency is equally important. Even in the concurrent planning field, teens are often ignored. As a result of this, average outcomes for children who age out of the foster care system are dismal, including high rates of homelessness, incarceration, and victimization.

Convening Activity: The convening explored the above issues with research data, anecdotes of successful permanent placements, and national and state models of successful reunification and adoption programs sponsored by private agencies, counties or states. Especially enlightening were a) models of child specific recruitment, b) reunification models focused on finding long-lost family, and c) research on which children find permanency, what attitudes and beliefs social workers hold about teen permanency and social workers' minimal use of recruitment strategies.

With a goal of using a standard definition in best practice guidelines and state policy documents, the convening developed a list of components essential to a definition of youth permanency. It reviewed historical and current barriers to youth permanency and current research and its limitations. The state of practice, policy, and organizational strategies was reviewed and assessed in light of research and experience. Finally, the group began to develop specific strategies to further build a strong foundation for best practices and policy in this area.

Outcome of Convening:

Based on the April convening, Stuart will convene funders to look at the next steps foundations may take, investigate ways to partner with other funders and national resource centers, and support a mechanism to bring together California parties. In Washington State, a mechanism for furthering this agenda exists that Stuart, as well as other funders, will support. Possibilities for funding include a concept paper, publications, support for work groups and a national conference.

Stuart Contacts: Pat Reynolds-Harris and Bill Bettencourt, Program Officers, Craig Evans and Rowena Pineda, Program Assistants (415-393-1551). Madelyn Freundlich, Legal Analyst for Children's Rights, Inc., New York City, facilitated the convening. ***For information, contact Mardi Louisell, Stuart Consultant, 415-682-3708. mjloisell@aol.com***

Permanence for Older Children and Adolescents
April 17- April 19, 2002

Full Summary

I. Background: 1999 Permanency Think Tank

The Stuart convening sought to build on the work of the 1999 Permanency Think Tank at the National Resource Center for Youth Development (NRCYD), University of Oklahoma. Dorothy Ansell, NRCYD, explained that, as NRCYD staff were exploring the concept of permanency planning for adolescents with consultant Bob Lewis as part of ASFA planning, they reevaluated their beliefs about adoption and independent living. They concluded that transitions were about teaching life skills, but also about youth safety nets and lifelines. NRCYD hosted a retreat with adolescents who provided practical suggestions for how to improve adoption efforts for youth. The evaluation culminated with the forty person Think Tank in Tulsa, sponsored by NRCYD, the National Resource Center for Foster Care and Permanency Planning, Hunter College, and the National Resource Center on Special Needs Adoption, Michigan.

The Think Tank identified three underlying principles essential to youth permanence.

- 1) Adolescents need connections with adults and peers throughout their lifetime.
- 2) Adolescents must be taught skills to prepare them to live interdependently.
- 3) Adolescents must be seen as central actors in their own futures and involved in the planning process.

Permanency, the gathering emphasized, is a state of mind, not a placement; permanency is having the feeling that you are connected, that there is someone in the middle of the night who will answer your phone call.

II. The Importance of Permanence for Youth, Pat O'Brien, Director, You Gotta Believe, Coney Island, New York

O'Brien focused his presentation on a) the connection between foster care placement and post-emancipation outcomes of foster youth, and b) the multiple possibilities for foster youth permanence.

You Gotta Believe does not define itself as an adoption or foster care agency but exclusively as an agency to address homelessness. As defined in the organization's articles, the agency works toward the "identification for every older foster child who needs one, of at least one adult who will unconditionally commit to and claim the older foster child as his/her, or their, own by providing a permanent loving home, family and relationship to that child." O'Brien cited the alarming statistics on outcomes for former foster youth, including homelessness and lack of work.* Between 50% and 70% of New York City's homeless youth reported having been in foster care. Forty percent (40%) of the nation's homeless were in foster care as children (Youth Today, 8, 3, March 1999). O'Brien cited Mark Courtney's Wisconsin Study on outcomes for emancipated youth twelve-eighteen (12-18) months after leaving care.

O'Brien compared what happens in a normal family, where college graduates often return home for an extended period before establishing their independence, with what happens to youth who emancipate out of foster care without support.

O'Brien cited examples of those who had adopted adolescents from congregate care to show the range of possibilities, many often not considered, e.g., social workers, school teachers, therapists, volunteers, AWOL resources, unexplored relatives, best friends' mothers, foster parents neighbors, church members and pastors; school crossing guards, cafeteria staff, and CASA workers.

*New York City's Study of Runaway and Homeless Youth Programs; Advocasey, Fall 2001, Vol. 3.No.2.

Contact: Pat O'Brien, You Gotta Believe, (800) 601-1779; (718) 372-3003
ygbpat@msn.com

III. Developing a Definition of Permanence for Older Children and Adolescents.

Two definitions of youth permanence were available: Miriam Landsman from the University of Iowa listed 1) legal status; 2) stability and appropriateness of placement setting; 3) connections to family and significant others; and 4) emotional well being in preparing for adulthood. Lauren Frey, Children's Services of Roxbury, proposed the following: "The highest level of physical, legal and emotional safety and security that can be attained for each individual child or youth within the context of a family relationship."

The group added the following thoughts:

--Legal status: Legal status is no guarantee when a child turns eighteen. We must think about commitment rather than documentation or legal issues.

--Placement: Connecting permanence with placement is not useful because, even though a child may be adopted, the child may need placement.

--Age: Permanence for teens is different than permanence for newborns. Because of teens' developmental stage, the definition must be flexible.

--Boundaries: The system sometimes stands in the way of allowing a permanent relationship between a child and its advocate. Adult liability, not child safety, determines this. For example, foster parents are told not to keep in touch; confidentiality prevents grandparents interested in grandchildren from receiving information; professionals are frequently told that boundaries preclude them from having a relationship with a child.

--Youth Involvement: Youth must help us define what permanency is for them.

The group identified the following components essential in a definition of permanency. 1. At least one adult; 2. A safe, stable and secure parenting relationship; 3. Love; 4. Unconditional commitment; 5. Lifelong support; 6. Involvement of the youth as a participant, perhaps a leader, in the process; 7. Finally, unless the child is not free for adoption, a child should be legally adopted. Frey's definition of "The highest level of physical, legal and emotional safety and security that can be attained for each individual child or youth within the context of a family relationship" was highlighted.

IV. Research:

A. Data on California Foster Care: Barbara Needell, Center for Social Service Research, University of California, Berkeley

Dr. Needell noted that California houses one-fifth of the nation's children in foster care.

- ◆ The majority of children in foster care are at least six years old, even though most children are younger than six when they first enter care. Of those age eleven and older, more than 40% have been in care more than 5 years.
- ◆ The older the child, the less likely he or she is to be adopted.
- ◆ Children in non-kin care are more likely to be adopted than children in kin care.
- ◆ The rate of adoption for African American children is considerably lower than the rate for White or Hispanic children.
- ◆ Half of placed children are eventually reunified with their families. Even those who enter at age eleven or older reunify. One third of adolescents who enter at 16 or 17 will reunify.
- ◆ As adoption has increased under ASFA, reunification may have decreased. The data suggests a change in statistics and should be examined.
- ◆ Children in foster care continue to be reunified well beyond the 12 month timeline, particularly those placed with relatives.
- ◆ Several studies show that emancipators from foster care have difficulty finding employment, have high rates of homelessness and have high rates of public assistance after leaving care.

Contact: Barbara Needell, (510) 642-1893; Fax: (510) 642-1895
bneedell@uclink4.berkeley.edu

B. Adoption Data from New York State: Rosemary Avery, Weiss Presidential Fellow, Department of Policy Analysis and Management, Cornell University

Avery uses the following data to find out why some kids get placed and others don't: a) event history analysis through the New York State Adoption Monitoring System; b) New York Blue Books; and c) a large case study approach to micro-level data on special high risk cases. Avery noted a direct correlation in her research between caseworker workload and the timeliness of child outcomes (adoption).

◆ On age and timeliness from the New York State Adoption Monitoring System

- Mean time to adoption is 5.95 years.
- Twenty percent of cases take longer than eleven years to achieve permanency.
- After eight years, the probability of adoptive placement is close to zero.
- Older age at entry is related to:
 - Higher number of placements
 - Reduced probability of adoption

Increased probability of aging out the system.

- Black and Hispanic children are likely to experience fewer placement in care.
- Other factors related to timeliness in adoption:
 - Higher caseloads at the county level decrease probability of adoption
 - Placement in a single-parent family delays adoption
 - Time to achieve TPR significantly impacts the probability of adoption.

◆ On age, gender, race and sibling groups from Blue Book Data

- Females are more likely to be placed than males
- Children who are younger at first listing have an increased probability of adoption
- Black infants were significantly more likely to be adopted
- Black teenagers were significantly less likely to be adopted
- Overall, white children are significantly more likely to be adopted
- Sibling groups listed together are significantly more likely to be adopted.

◆ On those with significant delays and instability in care from Large Case Study

- Children experiencing significant delays in placement are:
 - More likely to have substantial disabilities
 - More likely to have siblings within the system
 - More likely to be male
 - More likely to be African American
 - More likely to be older when they entered care
 - More likely to have entered because of neglect than abuse.
- Sixty-two percent (62%) of kids were not in foster home placements. They is, they were in placements such as ICUs, detention centers, group homes, etc.
- Children experienced significant instability while in care:
 - 66% had more than one placement
 - 40% had more than seven placements
 - 32% had three-five different caseworkers
 - 31% had more than six caseworkers.

◆ Research results on recruitment efforts:

- 60% of the children had adoptive parents interested in them at some point in time
- 36% had more than one home study
- 11% had more than six home studies.
- 53 % had tried adoptive placements
- 23 % had tried more than two adoptive placements
- 70% of current caseworkers had not used any of the seven identified recruitment techniques in the last year they had supervised the case.

◆ Research results on caseworker's attitudes and beliefs:

Research question: Do you believe this child is ultimately adoptive?

41% no 26% not sure

Does your agency believe this child is ultimately adoptable?

41% no 28% not sure

Is adoption still a viable option for the child?

33% no 31% not sure

Lessons from research on best practice showed that early interest in child must be followed up; that case must be managed intensively while the child is young; that adoption training and specialized recruitment training are essential for staff; that individualized adoption and recruitment plans must be done for foster children. General recruitment doesn't work. Avery stressed the high level of caseworker burnout and the necessity to reinforce the belief that every child is adoptable

Other Research Sources: Chapin Hall has done significant research on length of first placement and reunification.

Contact: Rosemary Avery, (607) 255-2578 (w); (607) 255-4071 (f); rja7@cornell.edu

V. The convening reviewed specific permanency practices and models according to the following structure: A. Tools for Decision-Making; B. Reunification; C. Adoption Models; and D. Less Traditional Models

A. Tools for Decision-Making

1. Family Group Conferencing (FGC) and Permanence: Karin Gunderson, Northwest Institute for Children and Families, University of Washington

The Northwest Institute for Children and Families in collaboration with the State agency is engaged in a Stuart Foundation-funded project to utilize Family Group Conferences (FGCs) for youth in group care, twelve and older, who do not have a permanency plan. Using the New Zealand model of family group conferencing, the project hopes to identify, engage and empower an expanded network of family and other significant adults as decision makers on behalf of at least seventy (70) youth in group care, thus facilitating permanent connections for high needs youth.

Numbers: Since 1996, approximately 600 conferences have taken place in Washington State for children of all ages involved with the foster care system. Kids twelve and over frequently attend their conference and are pleasantly surprised to see all those who attend. Although permanent placements are not achieved for all youth, usually healing and connections with family occur.

Logistics: In Washington State facilitators include social workers and providers in the community who have been trained in the model and are family-centered; however, they need not have an MSW. FGC requires significant preparation time to inform and coach all participants in the process, service providers, family members and youth, and to ensure that no one is adversely surprised at the meeting. The private family meeting time is used because feedback suggests that when professionals remain in the room, family members do not own the plan to the degree that they do when they meet alone; ownership of the plan is important to assure child safety and avoidance of re-victimization.

Cost: The FGC process takes an average of thirty hours (30), which includes preparation, facilitation of the conference and distribution of the plan. Agency workers

assigned to FGC can do four conferences a month if they do the all the preparation and facilitation themselves. If an outside person is used to facilitate, the cost is \$1000-\$1500 which does not include conference costs such as travel, food and childcare.

Note: When adoptive families want to return a child to the agency, Stanislaus County has had some success in preventing adoption disruptions through the use of family group conferencing.

Contact: Karin Gunderson, (206) 616-7424, kgund@u.washington.edu

2. Permanency Planning Mediation: Rob Marvin, Federal Review Project California Department of Social Services

The State of California has and Consortium for Children (a private not for profit) have created a unique form of Permanency Planning Mediation. Permanency Planning A family can be referred to mediation when it has failed at reunification efforts and is contesting the Termination of Parental Rights. When these cases are contested, the hearing can continue for up to one and a half years. The hope is that when the state goes to court, the parents will not contest the action, thus saving money and accruing benefits to all parties. The agreement is voluntary and legally binding.

The California model of Permanency Planning Mediation is field based – mediators meet with mediation parties in their homes. Mediators meet with all parties individually and then if appropriate, bring all parties together to determine a permanency plan that might include post-adoption contact. The Consortium for Children, in a grant funded by the State and Stuart Foundation, provides permanency planning mediation throughout the State of California. The consortium is not an adoption agency. The Consortium for Children has 150 Permanency Planning Mediators throughout the State of California. Mediators have received three days of Family Law Mediation and two days of Permanency Planning Mediation Training from Consortium for Children

Since 1999, the consortium has mediated permanence for 1,500 California foster children. It has been eighty (80%) percent successful in avoiding contested court action. The consortium has shortened the average time between the end of reunification efforts and adoptive placement from two years to 90 days. Fifty percent of the agreements completed are for children twelve and over.

Logistics: In the 120 day window from the time reunification is discontinued until TPR, the mediators may do up to twenty (20) contacts with various parties. In eighty percent (80%) of California TPRs, adoptive families are already identified. All parties must agree to take part or the mediation doesn't occur. Permanency planning mediators are primarily social workers, MSWs, attorneys trained as mediators, and psychologists.

Cost: \$3200 per case for the State. There is no cost for counties.

Contact: Kate Cleary, Consortium for Children, 415-458-1759, kate@consortforkids.org

B. Reunification

1. Intensive Family Reunification Project, M.B. Lippold, Marion Superior Court, Juvenile Division, Indianapolis

Marion Superior court uses a three phase model to reunite adolescents (both delinquents and abused or neglected children) who reside in institutions. As an example, consider the progress of Tommy, a sixteen year old from Indiana, who lived from the time he was nine in institutions in Wisconsin. Rights were never terminated, reunification was always the plan. Mother had no relationship with child.

Phase 1: Preparation (up to 42 days): Within one week of referral, services begin with the family, the youth, the residential facility, the young person's home school and others who may be pivotal in the successful reunification process, based on the youth's needs. In Tommy's case, Phase I was shortened because he resided in Wisconsin.

Phase 2: Intensive Services (3-4 weeks): Services are provided using the Homebuilder's Intensive Family Preservation model for up to twenty (20) hours a week. Tommy returned home and the family received services.

Phase 3: Increasing Family Independence (up to 12 months): Services decrease in intensity although an intensive crisis intervention period of up to four weeks is available if needed (provided in one week increments). Community based services are identified while the agency provides case management, advocacy and parent education. In Tommy's case, he remained home for a year and then was placed again. Even though he was placed, however, he now has a connection to his mother.

Access: The Reunification Program is accessed by both the probation and the child welfare systems. Contracted private agencies provide the services.

Cost: \$15,000 per child for a fifteen (15) month program. If more than one child from a family is involved, a rate is negotiated.

Statistics: 52% had not reentered the system; 27% were replaced; 21% went to the Department of Corrections. The program has reunified youth with aunts, uncles, grandmothers, and others. Payment has been kept in place even when the case has been closed in the system.

Contact: M. B. Lippold, (317) 924-7505, mblippold@mcjc.net

2. Family Preservation FAST Services and WRAP Services, Mary Stone Smith, Catholic Community Services (CCS), Western Washington

This intensive services program uses a wraparound approach to serve children/youth and families with severe histories. Children are referred either on an emergent basis to avert a hospital or group care admission (FAST Services) or on a non-emergent basis to avert a long-term institutional placement (WRAP Services).

The child in FAST services, often between 11 and 17 years old, has experienced numerous failed foster, group and/or residential placements, or has been repeatedly admitted for acute care psychiatric hospitalizations. Nearly always, the referent states with certainty that the child has no family, either extended or immediate, and the foster parent has refused to take the child back.

In seeking to stabilize the situation, CCS staff operates with the belief that every child has a family and that the single most identified variable contributing to positive outcomes for children involves unifying them with family members. Staff has seen the severe issues of youth improve dramatically when they find family.

Therefore, if immediate family members are not a resource, CCS staff begin an extensive search for family, broadly defined to include second and third cousins, relatives by marriage, relatives by adoption, and family as identified by the child or youth. If family is not immediately located, the agency asks for help from the Mormon Church or the Red Cross. Through these two groups as well as the Internet, CCS staff have learned how to quickly locate extended family throughout the United States as well as in other countries. After reunification, CCS staff stay in touch and provide follow up services as needed.

As an example, the agency worked with a 15 year-old girl who left her 39th therapeutic foster placement after only a few hours. Believed to have no family, the girl had moved from home to home since age 10, setting fires, assaulting adults and children and breaking windows. Hospitals refused to re-admit her and juvenile justice refused responsibility. She herself refused to live in foster care again and wanted her family.

FAST worked with the state Attorney General, and from a list of 3000 names, eventually found the mother in isolation in a Texas prison. Only an attorney was allowed to visit, so the agency hired an attorney to talk to her for a nominal fee (\$50). In response, the mother wrote her daughter, explaining her reasons for leaving, declaring her love, and providing a list of extended family members in a nearby Hispanic community. She worked her way out of isolation so her daughter could visit. Not surprisingly, as soon as the girl connected with her family, her behavior improved dramatically and she now plans to live with her Texas relatives after high school.

Outcomes and Information on the Two Programs:

400 children/families served per year.

At entry: All are either homeless, nearly homeless, or about to be admitted to a psychiatric unit or an institution.

At exit: 90% are living with immediate or extended family

At entry: 48% - 59% enrolled in school (many enrollments are tenuous)

At exit: 97% enrolled in school

FAST (Shorter Term Stabilization)

Number served: 250 families

Average length of service: 64 days.

At entry: 9% of children referred have a place to live.

At exit: 88% of children referred are united or reunited and living with family or extended family

Sixty-seven (67) youth were reunited with family members outside of Washington State with whom they had never lived; only two placements have not lasted.

6% enrolled in Job Corps

6% in long term foster placements or guardianships

Funding: Washington State mental health and child welfare share the cost equally. Mental Health administers the contract.

Cost: \$4600 per family per month for one to three months.

WRAP (Longer Term Services)

Served: 150 children/families per year.

Average length of service: 11 months

At entry: 100% referred for long-term institutional placement, long-term therapeutic foster care, or admission to psychiatric hospitalization

At exit: 91% living with family (68% home, 23% with relatives)

3% living in foster care

3% group/residential care

3% correctional facility

At entry: 64% had histories of one or more admission to psychiatric hospitals with an average stay of 14 days per admission

During services and following services (9-12 months post-exit): 4% readmitted to psychiatric hospitals (a significant cost savings for MH funders)

Funding: Funded through either Mental Health or Child Welfare, depending on referral source.

Cost: \$3300 per family per month.

Contact: Mary Stone Smith, (253) 225-0984, Maryss@ccsww.org

C. Adoption Models

1. Virginia Sturgeon, Consultant to State of Illinois, Former Adoption Specialist and Trainer with Kentucky Special Needs Adoption Program

Since 1979, Sturgeon has successfully placed over 100 adolescents for adoption, including a multiply handicapped nineteen year old, placed out of a nursing home. Her program focused on preparation and individual recruitment. The biggest barriers she faced were the agency and its workers, who didn't believe in adolescents' adoptability. Adolescents, out of self-preservation, often claimed they didn't want adoption.

Sturgeon pointed out that often social workers are not much beyond adolescence themselves and can't understand why an adolescent would want to move into a family when the workers have just moved out of their own families. Supervisors must recognize workers' developmental stages and nurture them through any issues that interfere.

Every adolescent must be prepared for adoption and every adolescent must be listed. The adolescent must have control over the content of the listing and feel they have some control over recruitment, the type of adoptive family they want and the visitation process – **but not over** whether or not adoption recruitment and placement occurs.

As an example of youth resourcefulness, Sturgeon told of finding a family in New Jersey for a youth in Kentucky. "I don't want to leave Kentucky," he said. "What are we

going to do?" Sturgeon asked. "You need a family." "I'll find a family," he answered. He went to a teacher and said, "I need to be adopted." The teacher adopted him and the family in New Jersey adopted one of the agency's other waiting children.

Contact: Virginia Sturgeon, (859) 299-2749, sturgeon@infi.net

2. Coordinators/2, Inc. Presented by Jacqueline Kidd, Executive Director, National Center on Permanency for African American Children, Howard University

Coordinators/2, founded by Sharon Richardson in Richmond, Virginia, received a three year grant that focused on the hardest to place children: 10 –17 year olds, sibling groups of three to five, and children with medical and mental health issues. Coordinators/2 developed a collaborative relationship with the custodial agency (Richmond Department of Social Services). The team identified children and developed a protocol for child specific services for each child, which included building a relationship with each child, assessment, preparation, pre-placement, placement and post-placement services. Because C/2 focused on the permanency resources already present in the child's life, getting to know the child was key. Out of 155 children with a goal of adoption, 127 were placed for adoption (88%). Over half were adopted by their foster parents. Three (3) disruptions occurred.

C/2 is now utilizing match retreats and adoption bowling parties to help find families for older children. They have found that once the youth and potential adoptive parents spend time together, there is a greater likelihood that they will be adopted. C/@ just began a new grant with Richmond DSS.

Contact: Lynn Edwards and Sharon Richardson, Coordinators/2, Inc. 804-266-2694

D. Less Traditional Models

1. Lauren Frey, Massachusetts Families for Kids, Children's Services of Roxbury

The goal of the twelve month project was to locate a permanent family connection for 100% of the 24 teenagers in the project, e.g., a caring adult committed to a lifelong parenting relationship that would be taken to the highest possible level of legal, physical and emotional security. The project took an exhaustive look at the network of current and past relationships through Community of Care Review© and Family Consultation Team© processes (similar to concurrent planning models in which youth identify the people involved), asking questions like: Who likes you, praises you, compliments you? Who's important in your life? Whom do you want to be in your life five, ten years from now?

Because youth had been hurt in the past and weren't going to reach out and ask for help again, the agency was proactive with an assertive goal-oriented model. It approached the individuals identified, concentrating on including rather than excluding

each person and asking what supports the project could provide to make this relationship work. The project didn't push permanent placements but the natural course of the relationship between the youth and adult developed into placements for a percentage of the youth referred.

Teens and young adults from the project's speakers' bureau, including youth who gained parents as late teens, acted as resources to project youth. This established hopefulness in youth who didn't have a connection; with hope, many youth who had functioned at the lowest level in RTCs, moved to the highest level.

Statistics: The project achieved its goal. For seventeen youth (75%), a lifelong connection to a caring adult was identified through the youth's past or current network of relationships. Of that seventy-five percent, one-third were reunified with birth family members, one-third were reconnected to former foster parents and one-third were reconnected with former child care staff, social workers, teachers and other non-traditional connections. Of the remaining seven youth (25%), localized recruitment in three churches identified more than enough families for those teenagers still needing a permanent family relationship.

The project's primary goal was a permanent commitment rather than a legal relationship or placement. However, in twenty-five percent (25%) of the total number of youth served, permanent placements resulted with their "lifelong connections." Twenty-five percent (25%) spontaneously asked for adoptive families.

Cost: \$5000 per youth for 12 months, plus a \$1500 flexible stipend for the family for transportation and food/activity costs during weekend visits with the youth. Massachusetts has a statewide, state-funded, post-adoption/guardianship program that can be accessed by families and youth.

Contact: Lauren Frey, (617) 445-6265, x342, lfrey@csrox.org

VI . Discussion of policy, fiscal and legal issues

The participant group was asked to use the following questions as a basis for exploring youth permanency and to consider what lessons can be learned from notable successes or failures in the youth permanency area.

Policy

--From a policy perspective, how would we know that we have succeeded in achieving permanency for older children and youth (as we have defined permanency in this convening)? What outcomes would we expect to see?

--Do any states/counties have policies in place that promote permanency for older children and adolescents (as we have defined permanency in this convening)?

--Can we say that federal policy promotes permanency for older children and youth in foster care? For example, to what extent does Chaffee Independence Act help states achieve this goal?

--Do any states have laws that define permanency in a way that is consistent with the definition that we have developed here?

--How does money affect permanency efforts on behalf of older children and adolescents? Is it "the" or "a" major barrier?

--Has any state/county developed workable financing strategies to support permanency efforts on behalf of older children and youth?

Organizational Strategies

--What do we know about organized programs in any states/counties to:

--Promote reunification, placement with extended relatives, and/or adoption for older children and adolescents;

--Recruit adoptive families specifically for older children and adolescents;

--Provide “post” services to older children/adolescents – that is services after older children/adolescents return to their parents, are placed with relatives on a permanent basis, or are adopted (particularly post-reunification and post-permanent placement with relatives)

--Extend independent living services to young people who have returned home, have been placed with relatives in subsidized guardianships, or have been adopted

--Promote non-traditional options such as mentoring, older sibling care, and other life long connections with supportive adults

The discussion elicited the following points:

1. *Incentives and disincentives to permanence*

Disincentives:

--Foster care parents are discouraged from adopting because there is no way to continue funding for services. Provide a supplemental adoption services contract that pays to let the family see the same therapist, etc.

--In California, adoption is a disincentive because of what percentage of funds the state and feds finance. Private agencies who find adoptive homes have no budget to recruit new parents for a child. If foster parents adopt, they lose the IL and college benefits.

--In Washington State, daycare is not provided through adoption support but is through foster care.

--Financial incentives point to keeping children in the system, primarily in foster care and RTCs. These institutions will suffer financially if more youth achieve permanence.

--Funding must match the outcomes we want or we will get the same outcomes.

Incentives:

--All foster youth are eligible for 100% financial aid from the federal programs available. Foster youth are not considered dependent for financial evaluation purposes.

2. *Staff issues:* Do focused recruitment and retention; address the role of supervisors in child welfare retention. Develop and prepare staff; give the most experienced workers the most difficult cases; provide mentors to staff. Increase pay for social workers, as has been done for California teachers.

3. *Collegiality:* Address turf issues between units in counties, between counties and between counties and private agencies.

4. *Permanence professionals:* Reconceptualize the notion of what it means to be a professional in the permanence area. Create an association of permanency workers where people self-identify with the profession, not merely with their employer. Have a joint conference of all these professionals.

5. *Youth Involvement:* Involve youth who have been part of the system in defining what family and permanency are to them. Be careful not to use involving youth as an excuse

to abdicate adult responsibility. Developmental stages affect one's decision-making ability. Sometimes youth aren't the ones who should make the final decision.

6. *Create Public Will*: Expand the dialogue beyond professionals present to include the public.

7. *Research*: What don't we know that we need to know?

8. *Barriers*: Examine what barriers we ourselves create to youth permanence, e.g., boundaries, etc.

9. *Concurrent Families*: Develop concurrent families for youth.

10. *Post Permanence Support*. Develop post permanence support.

11. *Goals*: Have small goals; develop concrete and specific strategies to achieve them.

12. *PR*. Develop methods to disseminate information and inspire change.

13. *Incentives*: Develop incentives for staff to achieve success, even if small.

14. *Cultural Competence*: Recognize the necessity of staff cultural competence and develop it.

15. *Language*: Realize its impact on permanency placement. At the convening we have focused on "hard to place" children but we should focus on "children who are in need of strong families." Focus not on diagnostic labels but on children whom the system has failed.

16. *Mental Health*: Increase mental health professionals' competence in child welfare and adoption; help them understand the unique circumstances of children who have had major losses; discourage permanently labeling children with a diagnosis. Unfortunately, the mental health funding stream requires a diagnosis, which tends to keep kids placed in congregate care.

17. *Systems*: To bring about change in any area, many systems must be influenced, the legal, the mental health, schools, and others.

18. *Accountability*: Determine accountability measures for the profession, for agencies and for counties and insist upon them.

19. *TPR*: The concept of termination of parental rights may need to differ based on the age of the child. Youth may have both a birth family and an adoptive/permanent family.

20. *Independent Living*: IL and discharge to self is not a permanent plan. Recommend a uniform code that generates change around this definition.

21. *Funding Streams*: Access resources connected to entitlements, categories and legal constructs outside child welfare.

22. *Education*: Partner with special education, a critical partner; when youth are expelled from school, we place them to find them an education.

23. *Partners*: Include CWLA, Children's Defense Fund and others in the discussion.

VII. Workgroups: Five workgroups were formed according to geographic area: California (2), Washington State, other states, and national. Their charge was this: *In thinking of how to make a difference in the area of permanency for older children and adolescents in your state, develop three specific action steps that can be achieved in a specified time frame (6 months – 1 year) in any of the following areas: Policy, Program, Resources, and Public Awards.*

For information on the convening, contact Mardi Louisell, Stuart consultant: 415-682-3708. mjloouisell@aol.com

WORKGROUP RECOMMENDATIONS

CHARGE: In thinking of how to make a difference in the area of permanency for older children and adolescents in your state, develop three specific action steps that can be achieved in a specified time frame (6 months – 1 year) in any of the following areas: Policy, Program, Resources, and Public Awards

GROUP: California
FACILITATOR: Gail Johnson

GOAL 1. Policy: Create State Policy as follows: No child shall be emancipated without a lifelong connection to a committed adult, and housing and job/training.

Action: ♦ Draft legislation that:

- Includes planning for permanent family connections to develop the highest level of legal permanence possible for each child.
- Includes in the legislation a definition of a permanent connection.
- Includes an exploration of possible life-long connections in the age sixteen transitional living plan.

♦ Add to the "emancipation checklist" that the court *may not* emancipate a minor unless it finds that the minor has a permanent connection to an adult.

Strategies:

- Use CASAs to identify families
 - Use family permanence conferencing at each stage; the youth under consideration defines the group that will conference

GOAL 2: Remove fiscal disincentives to adoption: All benefits extended to foster children will continue with the child after adoption (including IL services, transitional living programs, college subsidies, etc.)

Action: State Legislation required:

- Look for existing bill to which this might be added in the current year.
- If none available, find an author for next year.
- Recognize this is state-only money; research changing federal laws to allow for match.

Strategies:

- Partner with existing system change advocate organizations, e.g., California Partnership for Children and California Alliance for Child and Family Services.
- Do a comprehensive fiscal analysis ahead of time so as to effectively make the argument that the strategy is cost effective.

Group discussion on Goal 2.

The benefits issues is complex. The Adoption Assistance Program has grown enormously and has no means test, which means some people consider it suspect. Continuing benefits after adoption may erode our rationale for AAP and its cost benefits. That leaves us with the moral argument, compelling to some, but not to everyone.

GOAL 3: Review rules, regulations and policies to identify any of their unintended consequences that interrupt adolescent development, development of normal life skills, and meaningful relationships with adults, such as county/state rules that do not allow overnight visits with friends and requirements of unrealistic supervision (ex. swimming)

Strategy: A) Create a focus group primarily informed by youth. B) Make recommendations, publish and disseminate findings on what policy barriers now interrupt the potential for connection.

GOAL 4: Examine all current policies and belief systems that limit youth chances for permanence; this means redefining what is considered appropriate in terms of safe boundaries. Examples of policies or belief systems which may limit connections include professionals working with child cannot adopt, foster parents should not to hug, county workers are not allowed to adopt dependents of that county, and children may not have contact with former foster parents, CASAs, etc.

Additional Goals:

◆Make the definition of family in the law and in policy more fluid without undercutting the legal parents; make the definition child-centered, e.g., not, who does the child belong to, but who belongs to this child.

◆Do family permanence conferencing with a youth-defined group in every case at the following checkpoints:

1. Disposition
2. Prior to the 2-6 hearing
3. For all children twelve and older.

◆Educational, public awareness and service issues:

- Educate workers and advocates and attorneys about AAP.
- Change the belief that adoptive families should not get subsidies.
- Increase awareness in the general public of the need for adoption of older foster children, perhaps using tools such as the Dave Thomas Video. Consider target areas such as the faith communities, PTAs, etc.
- Coordinate service segments including mental health, judiciary, child welfare, attorneys
- Training: Provide training, a critical factor, at key groups' conferences and in counties.

On changing policy: *Be Aware of Attitude to Policy Change*

◆Determine what we want changed

◆Policy can be changed quickly if the will is present. Often, however, it takes time to develop the will.

GROUP: California
FACILITATOR: Teri Kook

TOPICS:

Forum for action

◆Use the California State Stakeholders group as a vehicle to continue convening work.

Collaboration between public and private agencies;

◆Develop a system to identify children that are available in the child welfare system so that private agencies, who may have adoptive parents available, know who these children are. Private agencies must become involved with counties earlier in the process, even before the child is freed for adoption – perhaps at 2773 reviews or at administrative review panels. Not all agencies know they can attend these reviews.

◆Do a family group conference with private and public agencies to find permanence for youth. Use collegiality, an attitude of "we are in this together," to identify strengths and barriers to private/public partnerships focusing on permanency for adolescents.

Funding:

◆Identify potential funding sources outside of child welfare, perhaps mental health and school systems.

◆Address the counties' resistance to using private agencies to find permanent/adoptive homes for their dependent children..

◆Examine the disincentives for businesses, e.g., group care, institutional care, foster family agencies. Include these groups in the discussion.

Special Units:

◆Consider specialized county permanency units for 11-14 year olds.

Permanency Continuum and definition of family:

◆Do not let legal status affect finding a permanent home. Family is not necessarily defined by legal status; if one finds the child a family, one can then sort out legal status.

GROUP: Washington State

FACILITATOR: Marie Jamieson

◆**GOAL 1.** Integrate the issues of permanence into existing state workgroups and training opportunities.

--Suggest people to be interviewed for input into State Task Force on Adolescents in Need of Long Term Placement.

--Hold Judicial Leadership Forum on Dependency. Bring data and issues about permanence for youth to that discussion.

--Bring national presenters to regional management teams and to staff training.

◆**GOAL 2.** Hold a one day convening on permanence for youth with participation of 40-50 persons.

Start with a philosophy of permanence for older children. Use the format from the Stuart Convening, centering the discussion around data and practice in the following areas: decision making tools, reunification, adoption, and post-permanency support. Use the available Washington State regional data. Include promising practices on family search, child specific recruitment, and family connections.

Invitation list will include persons who are interested in youth permanence from the following areas: judiciary, mental health, advocates, DCFS, funders, youth, church,

kinship parents, specific legislators, Red Cross, tribal child welfare and adolescent workers.

Next planning meeting: Washington State Workgroup: May 7, 2002.

Note: Meeting has been held and the group has scheduled a subsequent meeting.

GROUP: States other than California and Washington
FACILITATOR: Lauren Frey; **Reporter:** Peggy Slater

GOAL 1: Training Program – Achieving Permanency for Teens

Make available to all states at no cost a training program on the essential elements of achieving teen permanency. Frame the program in terms of the federal review requirements, identifying how each element of the program fits into one of those requirements. The program would have 5 parts:

Part 1: Kick-Off: Establish the need for teen permanency, featuring the Dave Thomas video “Making the Case for Child Specific Recruitment,” a Teen Speak-Out, and research data on outcomes for teens aging out of foster care.

Part 2: How to talk to teens about the role of permanency in their lives and the path to achieve permanency

Part 3: Doing teen specific recruitment

Part 4: Preparing adoptive or guardianship families for teens

Part 5: Providing post permanency support for families with teens

Details:

The program would be offered to the states without charge. They would, however, be required to submit their implementation plan for the program, along with a report on how implementation unfolded. The program would provide a range of possible plans; the state would then choose one or design a plan to meet its needs. Before resources would be invested for the program in a state, the program would gain assurance that it will be implemented. The program would provide an outline for the report on implementation.

The expertise necessary to design the program exists among those in attendance at the convening but it is not common knowledge across the country. It would be well worth the funding required to spread this information to all who work with teens in care.

Length of Training: A 5 day program would be offered for child welfare personnel; a shortened version would be available for judges, attorneys for children and other parties.

Time frames:

Months 1-3: Form a committee to seek sponsorship for the program and identify presenters and material

Months 3-6: Submit program information to the states, schedule dates with the states, and present initial programs.

GOAL II: Policy: NO child should be penalized for achieving permanency. Therefore, develop policy on the use of federal funds for college expenses of those s adopted out of foster care.

Twelve states support college tuition for children adopted out of foster care, some at any age, some if child adopted after age fourteen. Kentucky has extended free tuition in all state colleges to any child adopted out of Kentucky foster care. Develop committee from this convening to look at those twelve states and join with NACAC, CWLA and CDF to develop a package to present to the Congressional Council on Adoption.

Group discussion on college assistance:

Families who adopt teens don't have a long period of time to save up for college so requesting college assistance is reasonable and not as expensive as it sounds for the states. With college assistance, one encourages the youths' aspirations and provides a means to realize those aspirations. Illinois children in foster car get free tuition to all junior colleges. Children in subsidized guardianship don't have to consider their families' resources in applying for scholarships; this enables them to qualify for some scholarships for which adoptive children are not able to qualify.

Although all foster children are eligible for 100% adoption subsidy for college, in fact the larger problem is that few of them finish high school. (However, the children who have permanence do tend to complete their high school education.)

Some participants opposed scholarships because it is an easy thing for legislators to do and then believe they've done something significant when they haven't: it doesn't add that much to kids getting adopted.

Note on Kinship: Kinship financial benefits are a disincentive to reunification because the child loses benefits.

Time Frames:

Months 1-6: Develop policy

Months 6-12: Identify congressional sponsors and lobby for legislation.

GOAL III: Public Awareness and Research

A. Do research that speaks to teen permanence and success. Take a longitudinal look at what happens when kids become part of families, e.g., what are the outcomes of teen adoption?

B. Do research on matching characteristics so we can have some guidance in the future for how to bring people together successfully.

Time Frame:

Months 1-6: Develop concept paper for the RFP on research .

Months 6-12: Secure funders, issue RFP.

Research Note: Cynthia Flynn of the Center for Child and Family Studies which is affiliated with the College of Social Work, University of South Carolina, hopes to have results in Spring, 2003, from their federally funded adoption opportunities field initiated grant. The grant interviews the adoptive parent(s) and the adoptee separately, asking what the successful elements of teenage adoption are and how success is defined. The grant looks at different time periods in the adoption process, initial phase, maintenance, and long term, and will do a qualitative analysis of the interviews.

GROUP: National
FACILITATOR: Robin Nixon

ACTIONS TO TAKE:

1. Report of Convening:

Issue a report from this convening; disseminate it through fifty (50) publications and websites in six (6) months. Include the following: purpose, events of the two days, examples of programs, some description of the issues themselves and possible legislative or policy solutions to the dilemmas.

For example, one might focus on the front end of the system: What are the implementation steps to make sure permanence is taken into account from the start? Is the permanence social worker looking at which people are important to the child from the beginning? Make congregate care the last choice rather than first choice for teens. Eliminate ILP emancipation from the permanency lexicon. IL is a service, not a plan, and should not be considered an eligible category of permanency outcome.

Another possibility: Include in THE reauthorization language for the federally funded adoption assistance program an incentive for targeting older youth in care for adoption.

2. Conference on Permanence for Youth:

Have a date, sponsors and a plan for implementing a national conference. Videoconference it.

Response: The National Resource Center for Foster Care and Permanency Planning at Hunter College and National Resource Center for Youth Development at University of Oklahoma volunteered their services as collaborators.

3. Financial Policy Disincentives

Identify financial policy disincentives to permanence for youth.

4. Develop allies and opportunities to further achieve permanence for youth.

The federal government/administration, for example, has established a priority on youth development. Find the intersection between that and youth permanence. Each federal region will have a youth development summit. A) Get permanency for youth on the discussions' agenda. B) Get a permanence for youth person into that discussion.

5. Resource Packet:

Use the initial information sent out in preparation for Stuart convening as a resource packet for advocates, child welfare professionals, court personnel, and other child welfare stakeholders.

Stuart PERMANENCY FOR YOUTH CONVENING Participants---April 2002

- ◆ Allen, Robin, California CASA
- ◆ Ansell, Dorothy, National Resource Ctr. for Youth Development, Univ. of Oklahoma
- ◆ Avery, Rosemary, Cornell University
- ◆ Badeau, Sue, Consultant to New York City
- ◆ Biddle, Carol - Kinship Center, California
- ◆ Black, Berisha – Former foster youth, member of California Youth Connection
- ◆ Brown, Jim, California Department of Social Services
- ◆ Bussiere, Alice, Youth Law Center, San Francisco
- ◆ Freundlich, Madelyn, Children's Rights, Inc, New York
- ◆ Frey, Lauren, Massachusetts Families for Kids, Roxbury
- ◆ Gunderson, Karin, Northwest Institute for Children and Families
- ◆ Howard, Gene, Orangewood, California
- ◆ Jacobs, Jill, Family Builders by Adoption
- ◆ Jamieson, Marie, Families for Kids Partnership, Washington State
- ◆ Johnson, Gail, Sierra Adoption Services, California
- ◆ Johnson, Pam, Children's Bureau, Washington, DC
- ◆ Kaho, Karen Grace, California Foster Care Ombuds Program
- ◆ Kidd, Jacqueline, Nat. Ctr. on Perm. for African American Children, Howard University
- ◆ Kook, Terri, Stanislaus County, California
- ◆ Kroll, Joe, NACAC, St. Paul, Minnesota
- ◆ Lemley, Amy, First Place Fund for Youth, Oakland, California
- ◆ Lippold, MB, Marion Superior Court, Indianapolis
- ◆ Mallon, Gary, Natl. Resource Ctr. for Foster Care & Perm. Planning, Hunter College
- ◆ Marvin, Rob, Federal Review Project, California Department of Social Services
- ◆ Needell, Barbara, Center for Social Services Research, UC Berkeley
- ◆ Nixon, Robin, Natl. Foster Care Coalition, Casey Family Programs, Washington, DC
- ◆ O'Brien, Pat, You Gotta Believe, New York
- ◆ Olenick, Michael, Emancipation Services Division, Los Angeles County
- ◆ Oppenheim, Stuart, San Mateo, California
- ◆ Quintanilla, Maria, Latino Family Institute
- ◆ Salcido-Carter, Lucy, David and Lucille Packard Foundation
- ◆ Slater, Peggy, Illinois Department of Children and Family Services
- ◆ Soronen, Rita, Dave Thomas Foundation for Adoption
- ◆ Stone Smith, Mary, Catholic Community Services, Tacoma
- ◆ Sturgeon, Virginia, Illinois Department of Children and Family Services
- ◆ Weiss, Susan: Casey Family Programs, Seattle
- ◆ Wilbur, Shannan, Legal Services for Children, San Francisco
- ◆ Willard, Cynthia, Institute for Black Parenting, Los Angeles
- ◆ Wilson, Dee: Regional Administrator, Washington State Region

Stuart Foundation:

- ◆ Pat Reynolds-Harris; Bill Bettencourt; Craig Evans; Rowena Pineda; Mardi Louisell

RESOURCE LIST

Print

Avery, [Rosemary J., ed.](#) *Adoption Policy and Special Needs Children*, Auburn House, 1997. ISBN: 0-86569-212-2. Contains "The Adoption of Older Children" by Elizabeth S. Cole

Avery, Rosemary J. "New York State's Longest Waiting Children, 1998: A Study of New York State Children in Need of Adoptive Families." September 1999. Available at: www.nysccc.org

Avery, Rosemary J., and Butler, J.S. "Timeliness in the Adoptive Placement of Photolisted Children: The New York State Blue Books." *Adoption Quarterly.*, Vol. 4 (4) 2001. Contact: rja7@cornell.edu

Cornerstone Consulting Group, Inc. "Guardianship: Another Place Called Home." 2001. Contact: The Cornerstone Consulting Group, Inc., One Greenway Plaza, Suite 550, Houston, TX 77046, 713-627-2322; www.cornerstone.to

Courtney, Piliavin, Grogan-Kaylor, and Nesmith. "Foster Youth Transitions to Adulthood: A Longitudinal View of Youth Leaving Care." *Child Welfare LXXX.* #6, November/December.

Fahlberg, Vera M.D., "Child Development," Michigan Department of Social Services, The National Resource Center for Special Needs Adoption, A division of Spaulding for Children.

Landsman, Malone, Tyler, Black and Groza. "Achieving Permanency for Teens: Lessons Learned from a Demonstration Project." National Resource Center for Family Centered Practice. *Prevention Report* 1999 #2.

Lewis, R.G. "Adolescents and Families for Life. A Toolkit for Supervisors." (978) 281-1919; www.highpopples.com

Lewis, Robert G. "Permanency for Adolescents: Key Questions to Ask" (Draft). Contact: rglewis@rglewis.com or 978-281-8919

Children's Services of Roxbury, Inc. Massachusetts Families for Kids Speak Out Team. "We've Got Something to Say II" 2002. Contact: 617-445-6655 Ext. 303.

National Resource Center for Youth Development, University of Oklahoma (Charles and Nelson). "Permanency Planning: Creating Life Long Connections.. . What Does It Mean for Adolescents?" 2000. Contact: 918-585-2986. <http://www.nrcys.ou.edu/mono/pdf>

O'Brien, Pat. "Non-Traditional Recruitment for Teens & Pre-Teens." 1-800-601-1779. Contact: ygbpat@msn.com

O'Brien, Pat. "Teens in Foster Care: Preventing Homelessness through Relationship." Contact: ygbpat@msn.com

Palmer, Sally E. *Maintaining Family Ties: Inclusive Practice in Foster Care*. Child Welfare League of America, Washington, DC, 1995.

Pecora, Peter. "Child and Family Services in the United States: Our Recent Accomplishments and the Journey Ahead. 2001." Casey Family Programs. Contact: 206-270-4936; www.casey.org/research.

Robinson, Grace. *Older Child Adoption*. Crossroad Publishing Company, New York, 1998.

Smith, Wes. *Hope Meadows: Real-Life Stories of Healing and Caring from an Inspiring Community*. Berkley Publishing Group, 2001.

Stiffman, A., and Davis, L.E., Eds. *Ethnic Issues in Adolescent Mental Health*. Sage, 1990, Newbury Park, California.

Sturgeon, Virginia. "Adoption and Adolescents: A Handbook for Preparing Adolescents for Adoption." Contact: sturgeon@infi.net

Westat (Cook, McLean, and Answell). "A National Evaluation of Title IV-E Foster Care Independent Living Programs for Youth: Final Report. Phase I Volume I., 1989."

Contact Lauren Frey for additional print resources, 617-445-6655; lfrey@csrox.org

Models

Bandelet. A collaboration between social services and churches. Spaulding for Children, National Resource Center for Special Needs Adoption, 16250 Northland Drive, Suite 100, Southfield, MI 48075

Northeast Ohio Adoption Services (Thomas and Franz). "Families for Teens, Final Report, March 31, 2000." NOAS, 5000 East Market Street, Suite 26, Warren, OH 44484-2259; (330) 856-5582; www.noas.com

Northeast Ohio Adoption Services (Franz, Kathy). "Northeast Ohio Post Adoption Family Support Project: Final Report, 1993." Contact as above.

"Every Child Counts," "La Esperanza Para Los Ninos Que Esperan" – Hispanic Adoption Program: Hope for the Children Who Wait," among others. New York Council on Adoptable Children, 589 – Eighth Avenue, 15th Floor, New York, New York, 10018; 212-714-2788

Videos:

◆ Dave Thomas Foundation: "Finding Forever Families: Making the Case for Child Specific Recruitment." Orders of up to five videos are supplied at no cost. **Contact:** 1-800-ASK-DTFA or email: adoption@wendys.com

◆ "Adolescent Adoption." Excellent cameos featuring Kentucky teen adoptive families. Contact: Virginia Sturgeon, sturgeon@infi.net

◆ "Permanency Planning: Creating Life Long Connections. . . What Does It Mean for Adolescents." 2000, National Resource Center of Youth Development, University of Oklahoma's Think Tank. **Contact:** 918-585-2986. <http://www.nrcys.ou.edu/mono.pdf>

Play:

Bande: *Share Our Life . . . as Our Own* by Robert L. Douglas

Online Resources (Courtesy of R. G. Lewis)

Permanence & Adolescence

The National Resource Center for Foster Care and Permanency Planning at the Hunter College School of Social Work
<http://www.hunter.cuny.edu/socwork/nrcfcpp/>

The National Resource Center for Family Centered Practice
Achieving Permanency for Teens: Lessons Learned From a Demonstration Project
<http://www.uiowa.edu/~nrcfcp/new/index.html>

Family Group Decision Making...
<http://www.uiowa.edu/~nrcfcp/new/fal97.html#lisa>

National Resource Center for Youth Development
Permanency Planning: What Does It Mean For Adolescents?
<http://www.nrcys.ou.edu/mono.pdf>

Bob Lewis' permanence newsletter "*What Do You Think?*"
<http://www.rglewis.com/archive.htm>

National Child Welfare Resource Center for Organizational Improvement
Promising Practices for Youth Leaving Foster Care
Defining Safety, Permanency and Well-being Outcomes for Youth in Foster Care
<http://www.muskie.usm.maine.edu/helpkids/telepast.html>

Building Blocks for Youth (Juvenile Justice)
<http://www.buildingblocksforyouth.org/facts.htm#top>

Harvard School of Public Health. Rising Teens (*adolescent development*)
<http://www.hsph.harvard.edu/chc/parenting/raising.html>

The Casey Family Programs With links to other Casey resources
<http://www.casey.org/>

Adoption

Child Welfare League of America, website: cwla.org; Contact Ada White, awhite@cwla.org

The Evan B. Donaldson Adoption Institute
<http://www.adoptioninstitute.org/research/ressea.html>

The National Resource Center for Special Needs Adoption
<http://www.spaulding.org/>
Family Bound Curriculum
<http://www.spaulding.org/CenterSource/December-00.pdf>

New York State Citizen's Coalition for Children
<http://www.lightlink.com/nysccc/>

The Adoption Information Clearinghouse
<http://www.calib.com/naic/database/index.htm>

Kellogg Foundation Families for Kids initiative
<http://www.wkkf.org/Initiatives/Initiative.asp?ID=23>

North American Council on Adoptable Children (NACAC)
<http://www.nacac.org/>

The National Adoption Center
<http://www.adopt.org/nac/nac.html>

Adoption, The Future of Children
Published by The David and Lucile Packard Foundation
<http://www.futureofchildren.org/adp/index.htm>

North East Ohio Adoption Services
To request a copy of "Families for Teens" project report
<http://www.noas.com>

General Resources

Child Welfare League of America, website: cwla.org

The Children's Bureau Express (free email subscription)
With links to all Children's Bureau national resource centers
<http://www.calib.com/cbexpress/index.cfm>

Social Work on the Web
<http://www.library.csustan.edu/lboyer/socwork/bysubj.htm>

Child & Family WebGuide at <http://www.cfw.tufts.edu/>